

**LAWYERS' AND MERCHANTS' TRANSLATION BUREAU, INC.**

**Legal, Financial, Scientific, Technical and Patent Translations**

**11 BROADWAY**

**NEW YORK, NY 10004**



**Certificate of Accuracy**

**TRANSLATION**

From

Japanese into English

**STATE OF NEW YORK  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK**

} s.s. :

On this day personally appeared before me  
who, after being duly sworn, deposes and states:

Elisabeth A. Lucas

That he is a translator of the Japanese and English languages by  
profession and as such connected with the **LAWYERS' & MERCHANTS'**  
**TRANSLATION BUREAU;**

That he is thoroughly conversant with these languages;

That he has carefully made the attached translation from the original document  
written in the Japanese language; and

That the attached translation is a true and correct English version of such original,  
to the best of his knowledge and belief.

**SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME  
THIS**

**JUL 24 2006**

Susan Tapley  
Notary Public, State of New York  
No. 01TA4999804  
Qualified in Queens County  
Certificate filed in New York County  
and Kings County  
Commission Expires July 27, 2006

**CERTIFIED COPY OF  
PRIORITY DOCUMENT**

Refusal Assessment

Patent Application No.:	Pat. Appl. 2005-515090
Draft Date:	July 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2006
Patent Office Examiner:	Keiichiro SUZUKI 3141 5T00
Title of the Invention:	Card device
Patent Applicant:	Murata Seisakujo Co. Ltd.
Representative:	Kiyoshi IKARASHI

The subject application should be refused for the reasons disclosed in the notification of reasons for refusal dated April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

It should be noted that the written opinion and the procedural amendments have been examined, but no basis sufficient to override the reasons for refusal has been found.

Remarks

(1) In its written opinion dated June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2006, the Applicant states that "it is possible for an electrical supply terminal to be mounted by soldering with other components on a circuit board at the same time by means of reflow, due to the fact that the electrical supply terminal is made to be of surface-mount type".

However, as disclosed in Japanese Unexamined Patent Application H10-013287 (Figure 2) and Japanese Unexamined Patent Application 2001-284932 (Figure 4), making a

Filing No.:            Dispatch No.: 291401    Dispatch Date: July 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006

connecting structure in which plate springs are mounted on the surface of the circuit board and in which there is no piercing through the circuit board as a structure for electrically connecting the antenna with the portions of the circuit is common knowledge. This being so, making the connection between the bearing part 5 which constitutes the electrical supply terminal disclosed in cited document 1 which was notified in the previous notification of reasons for refusal and the circuit board a structure in which plate springs are mounted on the surface of the circuit board does not amount to more than what a person skilled in the art could appropriately achieve, as in the above-mentioned commonly known document.

Accordingly, the above-mentioned statement (1) of the Applicant cannot be recognized.

(2) In its written opinion dated June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2006, the Applicant states that "a configuration is adopted in which the tip end side of the antenna rotation shaft is formed narrow, and said narrow tip end side is supported by the antenna rotation shaft support part, and therefore since the torque for causing the rotation of the antenna rotation shaft is due to the thick portion of the area around the central part of the rotation shaft, it is easy to regulate the rotational torque".

Filing No.:            Dispatch No.: 291401    Dispatch Date: July 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006

However, as disclosed in cited document 4 which was notified in the previous notification of reasons for refusal, a configuration for the rotation shaft and the bearing in which the tip end side of the rotation shaft (the portion which is in contact with the coil-shaped spring) is formed narrow, and said narrow tip end side is supported by the antenna rotation shaft support part (the coil-shaped spring) is common knowledge. This being so, adopting a configuration for the bearing and the rotation shaft disclosed in cited document 1 (Figure 7 etc.) which was notified in the previous notification of reasons for refusal, which configuration for the bearing and rotation shaft is like that disclosed in cited document 4, does not amount to more than what a person skilled in the art could appropriately achieve.

Accordingly, the above-mentioned statement (2) of the Applicant cannot be recognized.

(3) In its written opinion dated June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2006, the Applicant states that "the through-hole into which the antenna rotation shaft is inserted has a configuration in which an enlarged diameter part having an inner diameter which is larger than the outer diameter of a projecting part for inserting the antenna rotation shaft from the outer side of the card case to the inner side of the card case in a direction running along the substrate surface of the circuit board, and a fitting part having an inner diameter which is

Filing No.:           Dispatch No.: 291401   Dispatch Date: July 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006

larger than the outer diameter of the central part of the antenna rotation shaft are integrally formed in sequence from the outer side of the card case, and therefore a configuration in which the rotational position of the antenna can be easily adjusted can be automatically added by means of an O-ring so that the antenna can be attached to the card case, in an operation in which the antenna rotation shaft is inserted into the through-hole and stops only at an E-ring on the outlet side of the projecting part in a state in which the O-ring is inserted from the tip end side of the antenna rotation shaft up to a position in which it is latched at the projecting part, and the operation to attach said antenna is greatly simplified".

However, as disclosed in Figure 1 of Published Utility Model Application H01-045141, adopting a configuration for the rotation shaft and the bearing, in which an enlarged diameter part having an inner diameter which is larger than the outer diameter of the projecting part for inserting the rotation shaft from the outer side of the case to the inner side of the case, and a fitting part having an inner diameter which is larger than the outer diameter of the central part of the antenna rotation shaft are integrally formed in sequence from the outer side of the case is common knowledge, and furthermore, as disclosed in Figure 2 of the same cited document, making a state in which the O-ring is inserted at the required position between the

Filing No.:            Dispatch No.: 291401    Dispatch Date: July 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006

rotation shaft and the projecting part, and, as disclosed in Figure 1 of the same cited document, inserting the rotation shaft into the through-hole and stopping the rotation shaft with a cap or the like are common knowledge. This being so, adopting a configuration for the bearing and the rotation shaft of the inventions disclosed in cited document 1 which was notified in the previous notification of reasons for refusal does not amount to more than a configuration like that of the above-mentioned commonly known cited document which a person skilled in the art could appropriately achieve.

Accordingly, the above-mentioned statement (3) of the Applicant cannot be recognized.

-----

In case of any dispute of the present assessment, a petition may be brought against the judgment to the patent office examiner within 30 days of the delivery of the certified copy of the present assessment (within 90 days for overseas residents) (Patent Law 121(1)).

(Instruction based on Administrative Case Procedure Law 46(2))

With respect to the present assessment, a suit for contestation may be filed for the judgment only in respect of a petition against the judgment regarding the present assessment (Patent Law 178(6)).

Filing No.:            Dispatch No.: 291401    Dispatch Date: July 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006

-----  
I certify that there are no differences between the above-mentioned and the items disclosed in the file.

Date of Attestation: July 4<sup>th</sup>, 2006, Secretary for Economy and Industry, Emiko HIRASE

整理番号:

発送番号:291401 発送日:平成18年 7月11日

1

## 拒絶査定

PCTMP118  
1170138

8/10

特許出願の番号	特願2005-515090
起案日	平成18年 7月 3日
特許庁審査官	鈴木 圭一郎 3141 5T00
発明の名称	カード装置
特許出願人	株式会社村田製作所
代理人	五十嵐 清

この出願については、平成18年 4月 7日付け拒絶理由通知書に記載した理由によって、拒絶をすべきものである。

なお、意見書及び手続補正書の内容を検討したが、拒絶理由を覆すに足りる根拠が見いだせない。

## 備考

(1) 平成18年6月12日付けの意見書において、出願人は、「給電端子を表面実装型とすることにより、給電端子は他の回路基板上の部品とリフローにより同時にはんだ実装することが可能」である旨を主張している。

しかしながら、特開平10-013287号公報(第2図)、特開2001-284932号公報(第4図)等に記載のように、アンテナと回路部分との電気的な接続構造として、回路基板上の表面に板バネを実装し、回路基板を貫通しない接続構造とすることは周知の構造である。してみれば、先の拒絶理由通知で通知した引用文献1に記載の給電端子である軸受け部5の回路基板との接続を、上記周知文献のように、回路基板の表面に板バネを実装する構造とすることは、当業者が適宜なし得たものに過ぎない。

よって、出願人の上記主張(1)は認められない。

(2) 平成18年6月12日付けの意見書において、出願人は、「アンテナ回転軸の先端側を細く形成し、この細くなった先端側をアンテナ回転軸支持部で支持する構成としたので、アンテナ回転軸を回転させるトルクは回転軸の中央部付近の太い部分に起因するため、回転トルクの制御が容易となる」旨を主張している。

しかしながら、先の拒絶理由で通知した引用文献4に記載のように、回転軸と軸受けの構成として、回転軸の先端側(コイル状のスプリングと接触している部分)を細く形成し、この細くなった先端側をアンテナ回転軸支持部(コイル状のスプリング)で支持する構成は周知である。してみれば、先の拒絶理由通知で通知した引用文献1(第7図等)に記載の回転軸と軸受けの構成として、引用文献



整理番号: 発送番号:291401 発送日:平成18年 7月11日 2

4に記載のような回転軸と軸受けの構成とすることは、当業者が適宜なし得たものに過ぎない。

よって、出願人の上記主張(2)は認められない。

(3) 平成18年6月12日付けの意見書において、出願人は、「アンテナ回転軸が挿入する貫通孔は、アンテナ回転軸をカードケース外側からカードケース内側に回路基板の基板面に沿う方向に挿入させるための、張り出し部の外径よりも大きい内径を有する拡径部と、アンテナ回転軸の中央部の外径よりも大きい内径を有する嵌合部とが、カードケースの外側から順次一体に形成された構成としているので、アンテナ回転軸の先端側からOリングを張り出し部に係止した位置まではめ込んだ状態でアンテナ回転軸を貫通孔に挿入して張り出し部の出口側でEリングで止めるだけの作業で、アンテナ回転位置を容易に調整可能な構成がOリングにより自動的に付加されてアンテナをカードケースに取り付けることが可能となり、そのアンテナの取り付け作業は非常に容易化される」旨を主張している。

しかしながら、実公平01-045141号公報の第1図に記載のように、回転軸と軸受けの構成として、回転軸をケース外側からケース内側に挿入させるために、張り出し部の外径よりも大きい内径を有する拡径部と、アンテナ回転軸の中央部の外径よりも大きい内径を有する嵌合部とが、ケースの外側から順次一体に形成された構成とすることは周知であり、また、同文献の第2図に記載のように回転軸と張り出し部との間の必要な位置にOリングをはめ込んだ状態とすることや、同文献第1図に記載のように、回転軸を貫通孔に挿入して、キャップ等で回転軸を止めることは周知である。してみれば、先の拒絶理由通知で通知した引用文献1に記載の発明の回転軸と軸受けの構成として、上記周知文献のような構成とすることは、当業者が適宜なし得たものに過ぎない。

よって、出願人の上記主張(3)は認められない。

---

この査定に不服があるときは、この査定の謄本の送達があった日から30日以内(在外者にあつては、90日以内)に、特許庁長官に対して、審判を請求することができます(特許法第121条第1項)。

(行政事件訴訟法第46条第2項に基づく教示)

この査定に対しては、この査定についての審判請求に対する審決に対してのみ取消訴訟を提起することができます(特許法第178条第6項)。

整理番号: 発送番号:291401 発送日:平成18年 7月11日 3/E

---

上記はファイルに記録されている事項と相違ないことを認証する。

認証日 平成18年 7月 4日 経済産業事務官 平瀬 恵美子